

PUBLISHED BY THE DOBROUDJA
ORGANISATION IN BULGARIA.

— № 2 —

MEMOIR

FROM

THE CENTRAL NATIONAL
COUNCIL OF DOBROUDJA

TO

THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE STATES
CALLED TOGETHER TO RESTORE THE
PEACE AMONG THE NATIONS



SOFIA — 1919

ROYAL COURT PRINTING-OFFICE

To the representatives of the states called together
to restore the peace among the nations.

MEMOIR
FROM
THE REPRESENTATIVES OF DOBROUDJA.

Numerous official communications indicated that the governments of some of the warring states are intending, at the conclusion of the forthcoming peace, to define the future political ownership of Dobroudja, without any regard to the desires, aspirations, rights and interests of its population. On its own part, Roumania, having lost this province in the field of battle, is attempting to win it back in the diplomatic field: even from the present moment it is trying through false statistics and through a perversion of historical facts to mislead the unbiased European public opinion, to the effect that the Roumanians have indisputable historic, ethnographic and economic rights over Dobroudja.

Being provoked by these communications and being exceedingly anxious as to its future political fate, the population of Dobroudja delegated on the 16 and 17 of December, 1917, its own representatives to the general assembly in the city of Babadag, in order to express its will, to defend its rights and interests and to point out to the whole world, under whose domination it wishes to remain in future. The assembly, having discussed the past, present and future political situation of Dobroudja and all the pro-

ects hitherto advanced with respect to its future political ownership, unanimously passed the following resolutions:

1. Demands the immediate annexation of entire Dobroudja, as far as the Danubian mouth, to Bulgaria.
2. Declares that the population of Dobroudja will not admit the return of the Roumanian domination on this side of the Danube and that it will fight with arms in hand against any foreign usurpation of its rights and liberties.
3. Appeals to the Bulgarian government and to the whole Bulgarian nation, to support and to defend the just cause of Dobroudja.
4. Requests all nations and all representatives of the states, anxious to restore the peace among the warring nations, to listen attentively to the insistent demands of the population in Dobroudja and, on the basis of these just demands, they should fix its future political destiny.

5. Empowers the Central National Council of Dobroudja, to prepare, in the spirit of the present resolutions, an extensive memoir and, through a special delegation, should submit it to the governments of the neutral and belligerent states.¹⁾

In fulfilling the mission imposed upon us, we — the members of the Central National Council of Dobroudja — consider it as our imperative duty to adduce and explain the motives and views on which the resolutions of the assembly are based, and to bring out before the governments of the belligerent and neutral states and before the disinterested public opinion of the whole civilised world at least an insignificant part of those facts, which may impart true conceptions as to the historical justice with respect to Dobroudja, as to its past and present ethnical

¹⁾ See Supplement No. 2.

and spiritual aspect, as to the rights, interests and aspirations of its population. Moreover, accepting all the logical consequences of the formula „peace without annexations, but with a right to a free self-determination of nationalities“, proclaimed by the Russian revolutionists, — we assume our position in our exposé firmly on the stand, that no one has a right to determine the future political ownership of Dobroudja without the consent of its population.

In the light of the ideas, from which originates that principle, and in accordance with the clearly and emphatically expressed will of the citizens in Dobroudja, we invite the favourable attention of the representatives of the states, selected to establish a just peace among the nations, upon the following facts and explanations:

1. Dobroudja in its geographical location, in its history and in regard to its population is a Bulgarian province. A mere glance upon the map of the Balkan Peninsula is sufficient to convince anyone that it is a part of the land of Bulgaria. Within it the Bulgarian prince Asparuh towards the middle of the seventh century founded the first Bulgarian kingdom, sanctioned through a treaty by the Bysantine emperor Constantine IV Pogonat in 679.¹⁾ From that year on up to the time of the Berlin congress — for a period of full 12 centuries — the political destiny of Dobroudja is being merged wholly with that of Bulgaria. During the period of the first Bulgarian kingdom (679—971) and of the second (1186—1393) it figures within the bounds of the Bulgarian state. Along with Bulgaria it endured the Bysantine yoke in the course of two centuries (971—1186) as well as the Turkish rule in the course of five centuries (1393—1878). The Turks conquered it towards the close

¹⁾ Le comte de Sègur. Histoire du Bas Empire. Paris 1858 Vol. II

of the XIV century while it was under the reign of its last sovereign, the Bulgarian Ivanko, son of the despot Dobrotich, who attached to it his own name.

Prior to that time-during the X, XI and XII centuries-according to the testimony of the Bysantine emperor-historian Constantine Prophyrogeneti (912—959)¹⁾ of the Russian chronicler Nestor (1056—1116) and other recorders of the middle ages, this province had been calling itself „Black Bulgaria“, The Bavarian, Schiltberger, who had traversed the Danubian lands after the fall of Bulgaria under Turkish domination, calls Dobroudja „the third Bulgaria“.

„I visited — says he — three Bulgarias. The first Bulgaria lies opposite the Iron Gate; its chief city is being called Vidin (Pudem). The second Bulgaria lies on the opposite side of Wallachia; its capital is Tirnovo (Ternau). The third Bulgaria lies near the Danubian mouth; its capital is Kalyakra (Kallacerka).²⁾“

2. Through the entire period of Turkish domination, Dobroudja, as well as the whole of Eastern Bulgaria, owing to strategic and political considerations, was colonised by Mussulman elements — Turks and Tartars, but notwithstanding that it did not lose its Bulgarian character. Foreign travellers, who, during the XVII century and later, had been passing through this province, testify to the effect that within it there had existed large Bulgarian settlements, which had strenuously adhered to their national and religious peculiarities.³⁾ What was the power and influence,

¹⁾ Const. Prophirogenete. *De administrando imperio*, p. 113.

²⁾ *Reisen des Johannes Schiltberger*, München, 1859, p93.

³⁾ See. a) *The Travers Macarius Patriarch of Antioch transl. F. C. Balfur. A. M. Oxon.* London V. I. p. 42. 42 b) *Monumenta spectantia historiam Slavorum meridionalium.* Vol. XVIII, *Acta Bulgarie ecclesiastical*, ab. a. 1565 usque ad. a 1799. p. 264. c) *Boskovich*

which these Bulgarian settlements had been having at the commencement of last century, is shown by the fact that during the Russo-Turkish war in 1806—1812 the commander-in-chief of the Russian forces Prince Bagration had deemed it indispensable to appeal to the Bulgarian population in Dobroudja with a special proclamation and to counsel it to remain quietly at home.¹⁾

After the Russo-Turkish wars, during the second half of the XVIth and the first half of the past century, in Dobroudja had settled, alongside of the Bulgarians and Turks, small groups of other nationalities, such as Kosaks from Ukraina, Moskovite Lipovans, Crimean Tartars, Greeks from Constantinople, Armenians, Germans from Alsace, Italians, Wallachians, Moldovans and Transylvanian Mokans. Impelled by necessity and drawn to the extensive fields of Dobroudja, devastated through the wars, all these nationalities had come as fugitives from their native lands in search of shelter, livelihood and easy income among the local population. The new colonists, however, owing to their small numbers and economic debility, in no way succeeded in changing the Bulgarian character of the province. Settled in compact masses in the most fertile regions of Dobroudja, the Bulgarians during the last century had become a remarkably moral and economic force, which asserted itself as a leading factor in the public, intellectual and economic life in the province. This force was particularly noticeable after the Russo-Turkish war of 1828—

J. Voyage de Constantinople en Pologne. pag. 153. German edition: Des Abt. Joseph Boskovich. Reise von Konstantinopol durch România. Bulgarien und die Moldau nach Lemberg in Polen. Leipzig 1779.

¹⁾ „Journal de campagnes faites au service de la Russie (1809) par le comte de la Langeron, c. Baron Eudoxiu de Hurmuzaki. Documente privitore la Isloria Românitar. Vol. III., supl. 1 (1709—1812), p. 176.

1829. By means of its proverbial industry and illimitable energy, the Bulgarian population succeeded only within a course of a few years to efface all the traces of the destructive war. Its creative hand turned the waste lands into flourishing villages, the weedy fields — into grain-yielding spots, the decayed and impoverished cities — into lively and rich commercial and trade centres. The economic life of the entire province was restored, maintained and developed by the energetic Bulgarian merchants, tradesmen, farmers and herdsmen. Along with this movement, there commenced also the intellectual awakening of the people. In the villages and cities were opened Bulgarian schools and reading rooms, Bulgarian churches were built up and educational, benevolent and economic societies were organised by the Bulgarians. Even as early as in the years 1811—1812, when the Bulgarians in Thrace, Mysia and Macedonia, oppressed by the Greek spiritual authorities, were being taught in Greek schools, the Bulgarians in Tultcha had opened a school wherein they might be taught to read and write in their native tongue. In 1855—1856 the city of Tultcha consecrated its public school under the name „Luminous Bulgaria“ and in its name it expressed the ideals and the aims which inspired not only the Bulgarians of Dobroudja but also of the entire Bulgarian nation.

When about the middle of last century the Bulgarians started a campaign against the ecclesiastical yoke of the patriarchate in Constantinople, the people of Dobroudja took their stand in the front ranks of the fighters, who were working for the church independence of the Bulgarian nation. Dobroudja became an inexhaustible source of Bulgarian energy, of lofty Bulgarian national consciousness and a firm active spirit. It gave birth and honoured Bulgaria with one of the most legendary heroes in the Bul-

garian revolutionary epoch in the person of Stephan Karadja. It sent its own representatives in the Bulgarian National Assembly, convoked in 1871 at Constantinople in order to organise the Bulgarian autonomous church. It sent a deputee Bulgarian in the first Turkish parliament (1876). Its villages and cities gave many of their sons to the Bulgarian revolutionary organisations, to the insurrectionary bands and to the national volunteer forces, which participated in the Russo-Turkish war of 1877—78.

During the period between 1870 and 1877 the Bulgarian intellectual and economic might attained very high development. The war of 1877—1878 found within it about 80 Bulgarian common schools in towns and villages, almost as many churches, 10 reading rooms, a Bulgarian gymnasium of four classes, a Bulgarian Episcopacy with its seat in Tultcha, a Bulgarian share-holding company for import and export and banking operations, tens of trades associations and — chiefly — a Bulgarian citizenship, which was quite ripe for political freedom.

3. The campaigns which the Bulgarians in Dobroudja conducted along with the whole Bulgarian nation for its spiritual and political liberation, their purely Bulgarian ideals and aspirations, their active participation in all the strictly Bulgarian affairs and movements — all this emphasises once more in a distinct manner the Bulgarian character of our native land. The ethnical, intellectual and economic unity of Dobroudja with Bulgaria was so strikingly and so sharply manifested in the above-mentioned movements, that it could not be denied even by the Turkish government, nor even by the Great Powers, which had assumed the protection of of Christian population in the Turkish empire after the memorable events of 1876. This unity was acknowledged officially in two diplomatic acts of international importance and conspicuousness: 1), in

the Sultan's decree of February 28. (March 12) 1870 and 2), in the protocols of the Constantinople conference in 1876, together with the projects of reforms, prepared by the Great Powers in regard to the reorganisation of Turkey.

The Sultan's edict included within the territoriel province of the Bulgarian Exarchate all those Bulgarian lands, in which the population had acknowledged itself as Bulgarian in the struggles against the spiritual subjection to the patriarchate in Constantinople; Dobroudja was placed within the number of these lands.

The Constantinople conference had decided that an autonomous government be given to Bulgaria, the latter being divided into two provinces: the eastern-with the principle city Tirnovo and the western-with {the chief city Sofia. Within the limits of the eastern autonomous Bulgarian province the whole of Dobroudja was also included as far as the mouth of the Danube (the Tultcha district.)¹⁾

The complete objectivity of this project could in no way be doubted. The initiators and guarantors for its impartial application are the most authoritative representatives of all the European powers among both of the warring groups to-day: Count Werther, Count Zitchi, Count Kalich, Count Bourgon, Count Schodori, Lord Salisbury, Count Korti, Count Ignatieff, Münster, Beust, D'Harcourt, Manobrea and Schouvaloff.

In the first session of the conference, which took place on December 26, 1876, Lord Salsbury had declared, that „the projects were composed on the grounds which England had presented-“ Count Schadoni had said that „for the composition of said documents recourse has been had to the former documents upon the subject as well

¹⁾ See Protocle Nro. 1 of December 23, 1876 of the Constantinople conference, Supplement C: Respecting Bulgaria — project for organic By-Laws.

as upon the notes exchanged between the Powers." The Austrian representative Count Zitchi had added that „the greater part of the motives of said documents may be traced to the Austrian note of December 30, 1875, which all the Powers had accepted."

These emphatic declarations prove unmistakably that the decisions of the conference are neither accidental nor arbitrary acts, but are the result of careful premeditation and a study and consideration of all those conditions, which at that time could have guaranteed the peace in the East. One of these conditions expressly indicated in the above-cited project was likewise the political unity of Dobroudja with Bulgaria. Solid Europe in 1876 acknowledged not only our right to a free life and an autonomous government, but also our right to join our native land to that of our common fatherland — Bulgaria.

4. The events, which followed the historic decisions of the Constantinople conference, annihilated its own act of justice. The sacred right of nations that they themselves may determine their own political destiny was suppressed. The international treaties, which marked the close of the war in 1877—1878, instead of sanctioning the equality among the Balkan nations and of perpetuating the peace in the East, created conditions for new blody conflicts in the future, an epilogue of which is the present great war.

The San Stefano and Berlin treaties, regardless of right, detached Dobroudja from Bulgaria and made a present of it to Roumania. By reason of the San Stefano treaty, Russia of the Tsars used Dobroudja as a coin of exchange, in order that therewith it may repay for Bessarabia, which Europe had taken away from it in 1856.

Art. 19 of that treaty shows us that the object pursued was to effect an ordinary commercial transaction by trading with the political fate of Dobroudja — a repre-

hensible conduct which history rarely records. This article provides: **I**The extent of the military indemnity is fixed to to the amount of 1410 million roubles, which Turkey must pay: a) by giving Dobroudja, which Russia accepts not for herself, but in order to exchange it for Roumanian Bessarabia, annexed to Russia in 1856 in accordance with the Paris treaty ; b) by using Armenia in the same way.

These two provinces were estimated to have a value of 1100 million roubles, while the remainder of the indemnity, amounting to 310 million roubles was to have been paid later on.

The injustice of this act is apparent: through it we are returning to the epoch of commerce with human beings. From a politico-judicial standpoint that act could not constitute a title to a political possession or to any other rights, since the political ownership of a territory does not make that territory an object for commercial speculative transactions.

The Congress of Berlin in its decisions excluded the motives of the San Stefano treaty with respect to the commercial transaction in connection with these two lands. It does not give Dobroudja to Roumania in exchange for Bessarabia. Dobroudja, according to its decisions, is not the price whereby Bessarabia may be repaid to Roumania. That is clearly seen in the provisions of art. art. 43, 44 and 45 of the Berlin treaty. In art. 43 it is said: „The above parties to the contract acknowledge the independence of Roumania under the conditions expounded in the following two articles.“ (Articles 44 and 45).

Art. 44 obligates the Roumanian principality to guarantee the civic, political and religious equality of its subjects, while art. 45 — to return Bessarabia to Russia. Bessarabia, consequently, was repaid to Roumania through the recognition of Roumanian independence.

Dobroudja was detached from Bulgaria owing to considerations, which have nothing common with the provisions of article 19 in the treaty of San Stefano.

The undisguised pretensions on the part of Russia to impose its protectorate over the Balkans, to restore and extend its influence in the Near East, induced Europe to neglect the just aspirations of the Bulgarian nation and to destroy its unity for which the Constantinople conference had been working. Being unacquainted with the virtues and qualities of the Bulgarian nation, its boundless love for freedom and its stubborn determination to guard the integrity and independence of its native land — the creators of the Berlin treaty saw in the new Bulgarian state only a Russian outpost, a blind Russian tool in the Balkans. And Dobroudja became the victim of this error, which subsequently was disproved by the events. Out of Dobroudja they wanted to form a sort of partition, a bulwark against Russian encroachments in the Balkans. They gave it to Roumania, not because the latter had any historic, ethnic or any other kind of rights over that province, but because they believed that Roumania will be a faithful guardian of the Danubian mouth and of the road which leads thereby towards the Straits.

The present formidable war disclosed unquestionably how much European diplomacy had been deceiving itself from the year 1878 on in its objects, considerations and hopes. Roumania did not justify the confidence which Europe reposed on it, for it disregarded its obligations. „The loyal Danubian guardian“, placed by the Berlin congress near the mouth of the Danube in order to defend the Balkans from Russian incursions, deserted its post and became a good promotor of the aims for conquest on the part of Russian Tsarism and thereby it lost the apparent rights, which it had acquired, together with its obligations with respect to Dobroudja.

Therefore, in 1878 the Roumanians themselves acknowledged that they have no rights whatever over that province and did not wish to assume the obligations, which were being thrust upon them. As far as they were concerned, Dobroudja at that time was a gift which was undesired, dangerous and forced upon them. Even on the eve of the treaty of San Stefano, when the purposes of Tsar's Russia became well known, the Roumanian statesmen, public men and other prominent individuals unanimously and positively affirmed, that they do not wish Dobroudja, because it is a Bulgarian land, and, as such, earlier or later they must lose it.

On the 7-th of February, 1878, the Roumanian historian and prominent deputee V. Al. Urekya of the Roumanian Chamber and the noted senator Prince D. Gika of the Bucarest Senate through interpellations demanded of the government to express itself with reference to the Russian intentions and added that they were decidedly opposed to them. V. A. Urekya, having brought out the historic rights of Roumania, declared amidst the stormy and unanimous applause of the Chamber, the following: „We cannot give Bessarabia for any sort of territorial compensations. No, we are not a nation of conquest: having drawn out our swords, in order that we may obtain our independence, we did not contemplate to deprive others of their independence. We do not wish to sow storms within our future, by annexing lands, which do not belong to us.”¹⁾

At the same time Prince Gika in the Senate, unfolding in detail his interpellation, said: „I wish to reaffirm the view that the Roumanian nation does not desire to ex-

¹⁾ See. Monitorul official al României. No. 21 from February 8, 1878, page 499.

change the land of its forefathers. I want to reaffirm that we did not enter the conflict in order to secure conquests."¹⁾

The two interpellations having been discussed, both the Chamber and the Senate passed one and the same resolution, whose concluding part is as follows:

„The Senate and the Chamber declare that they are determined to support the territorial integrity of the state and not to permit an expropriation of its land under any designation whatever or in return of any compensations and indemnities."²⁾

Taking cognizance of this resolution, the official newspaper „Romanul“, the organ of the liberal party, in its issue of February 8, 1878, contained a leading article, in which we read:

„We do not accept in the form of compensation even the least piece of country belonging to others. We wish to remain — whether it is much or little — just with that which is ours, positively ours, [no matter how tempting may be the promises, which are being offered us. When the Roumanians shed their blood and expended their wealth for the liberation of the Christians across the Danube, they did not understand that they will be paid for the services rendered. They did not go to liberate a nation enslaved for centuries in order to appropriate later part of the land of its forefathers.“

The organ of the Roumanian conservative party „Timpul,“ of January 29, 1878, in a leading article contends: „The whole of Roumania is situated on the left bank of the Danube, and in the position in which we find ourselves now, we possess that bank as far as the Black Sea. According to the territorial alteration, which is being

¹⁾ See the same page 445.

²⁾ See the same pages 446 and 451.

proposed to us, we will follow the left bank of the Danube as far as Galatz and thence we will pass over into the right bank and we will own far from us, separated through the Danubian ices for a period of 4—5 months, a fragment from Bulgaria, always envied, coveted by the new state, and later on, perhaps, again taken away from us, since everything which is not natural, is not lasting. Out of what is being offered us, we have no interest in clamouring for more than the part, which belongs to us, which always has been ours and which is neither Bulgaria, nor Dobroudja, but simply a part of Bessarabia. That part is the Danubian delta, including Kilia, Sulina and St. George, the little islands in these three channels, the sea isles, which lie opposite them and the Serpent's island."

On March 9, 1878, the Roumanian government transmitted a memoir to the Great Powers, in which it declared, that it is not willing to exchange Bessarabia with Dobroudja, because the possession of the latter will „constitute a complication, a burden and a constant danger“.¹⁾ Being called to the session of the Berlin congress on July 1, 1878, the Roumanian plenipotentiaries Mihail Kogalnitchanu and Ivan Bratianu explain the views promulgated in the memoir and present no pretensions whatever with respect to Dobroudja.²⁾

When the decision of the Berlin congress regarding Dobroudja and Bessarabia became known, in Roumania there arose storms of indignations and protests. Only the ministers Kogalnitchanu and Bratianu, as well as their nearest friends, receded from their original position with respect to the Bessarabia and Dobroudja questions and

¹⁾ See „Timpul“ number 64 of March 22 1878, and „Romanul“ of March 7, the same year.

²⁾ See protocol of the Berlin congress No. 10 of July 1, 1878.

endeavoured to adduce arguments, in order to convince their fellow-countrymen, that Dobroudja is of vital necessity to Roumania. In reply to their assertions, 46 deputees from the Chamber met in a private session and passed the following resolution:

„The Chamber, having listened to the reply of the government and having persisted in the unanimous decision of the national representatives on January 26, 1878, strongly protests against the dismemberment of the state through the occupation of Bessarabia by Russia and, considering the fact that any kind of annexation of territories on the other side of the Danube is opposed to the interests of Roumania and will prove a cause for future complications and disturbances, does not approve of the annexation of Dobroudja to Roumania under any conditions whatever and under any designations whatever.”¹⁾

„That is, says the deputee N. B. Lakustanu, a protest against the occupation of Bessarabia by Russia, as well as a refusal to participate in the despicable trade, which expropriates a Roumanian land in exchange of another section of territory, inhabited by alien races, a refusal to become participants with those, who are ordering that a population pass from one foreign domination under another and which population belongs to itself and by disregarding the eternal principles of justice, for they are forcing us to play the double role of victims and executioners, of plundered and plunderers — a degrading role, which we do not wish to play.”²⁾

Referring to the resolution cited above, the same deputee N. B. Lacusteanu issued a regular pamphlet whereby, having refuted all the arguments of the Rou-

1) „Timpul“ No. 153, July 14 1878.

2) „Timpul“ No. 153, July 14, 1878.

manian government and having brought out the fact that Roumania has no rights upon Dobroudja, makes the following statement:

„After all the arguments presented, we do not accept Dobroudja.

From a geographical and ethnographic standpoint:

Because, Roumania, being separated from it not only through a big river, but also through several rivers, such as are the various channels on the Danube, which through the larger part of the year render the communication between these two lands not only very difficult, but almost insurmountable, and being inhabited by a population, which in its majority is of an alien nationality and religion, — it does not belong to us whether regarded from a geographic or ethnographic standpoint.

From the viewpoint regarding the rights of nations:

Because the cession of a territory by one state to another, even though the transaction be effected amicably, as well as by force of a conquest, is opposed to the ideas of justice.

Because the annexation of one territory to another could only be lawful, when it is grounded on the regularly expressed will of the population of said two territories — something, which was observed neither by Russia in relation to Bessarabia, nor — by Roumania in relation to Dobroudja, and without which condition the annexation of these two lands constitutes a forcible occupation, which we must not permit, as opposed to our temperament.

From a political point of view:

Because that, {in which consisted and in which will consist our political standing in that part of Eastern Europe, is, that we are a homogenous people of Latin extraction; because, by violating the unity of the Slavic

race and by going into direct contact with it, to mix up with the Slavic race from Bulgaria, we lose that standing.

Because, by appropriating a land, over which we have no ethnic rights, we will justify and will sanction the plunder effected to our detriment by Austria in 1775, and by Russia in 1812.

Because by annexing Dobroudja, a part of real Bulgaria, we will give an example as perpetrators of injustice, which one day may be applied against us.

Because Roumania could not possess permanently a foreign land, surrounded by a foreign aggressive race.

Because the annexation of a part of Bulgaria to Roumania will create an eternally open wound, an apple of strife between these two states, which will be constantly and successfully exploited by those, who have an interest to see us involved in animosities and conflicts with the Bulgarians.

Because that will generate within the near future a new Bulgarian question, which will continually disturb the affairs in the East by those, who are seeking advantages in entanglements of that kind.¹⁾

5. The Roumanian government, irrespective of all political ethics, ignores both the will of the Roumanian nation and that of the parliament; it accepted Dobroudja with the consciousness that it entered into possession of a Bulgarian province, over which it had no right to dominate. Superinduced by this consciousness, official Roumania from the first to the last day of its domination was governing our native land in a manner, which excluded even the most elementary conception of right, justice and freedom. Its rule during the last 38 years was an uninterrupted chain

¹⁾ Dobrogea de N. B. Lagusteanu. *Representatul colegiului de Romanati in Adunarea Legislativa*. Bucuresci 1878, p. p. 86, 87 and 88.

of systematic administrative violences and lawless acts, actuated by juridical partiality, by organised plunder — by spiritual and political oppression, the ultimate object of which was to weaken the native population in Dobroudja, in order to Roumanise the same and, if that be impossible, to be driven out of the country and to be replaced by Roumanian colonists, brought into the province from the other side of Danube.

When on November 26, 1878, the Roumanian authorities for the first time were entering into our native land, the late Roumanian king, then prince Carol, with a manifesto, written also in the Bulgarian language, solemnly promised to the population of Dobroudja, that its honour, life and its property, its civic and political equality and its religious freedom will be fully safeguarded by the Roumanian laws. „The most sacred and the most valued human gifts — it was said in the manifesto — such as life, honour and property are placed under the protection of a constitution for which many nationalities are envying us. Your religion, your families and the threshold of your habitations will be defended by our laws and no one will commit any violence without receiving the due punishment therefor“ . . . „You Christians, and you Mussulmans, greet the Roumanian authorities with confidence; they come with the sole object of putting an end to those sad trials through which you have passed, to heal the wounds, which were inflicted upon you by the war, to defend your person, and your lawful interests and finally to labour for securing your moral and material welfare“ . . . „And thus, greet with affection the Roumanian flag, which for you will be a flag of liberty, justice and peace“.¹⁾

These very generous promises were not a mere ex-

¹⁾ See Appendix No. 2.

pression of good-will on the part of the Roumanian Government, but an imperative obligation. Art. 43 of the Berlin treaty distinctly provides that the independence of Roumania is acknowledged and recognised under the conditions, indicated in the succeeding art. art. 44 and 45. In art. 44 it is said:

„The difference in faith and religion could not be construed in Roumania as a cause for the restriction of some of the citizens in availing themselves of the full and complete enjoyment of civic and political rights of accepting public offices, vocations and honours, or of exercising the various callings and trades in any place whatsoever.

The liberty and external exercise of all divine services are insured for all Roumanian and foreign subjects, and no hindrances could be placed in the way of the hierarchical organisation of the various religious communities, nor in their relations towards their own spiritual leaders.

The subjects of all the Powers, be they of a commercial or any other kind of calling, will derive the benefits of equal rights, regardless of their religions.“

The Roumanian governments did not fulfil the solemn promises of king Carol, nor the obligations which Europe imposed on them. From the very first days of their domination over Dobroudja, they suppressed the religious freedom of the local Bulgarian population.

The Schismatics — the Bulgarians of Dobroudja, were forced to separate themselves from their autonomous church of the Exarchate, for the creation of which they had been struggling for 50 years; they were compelled to discontinue their relations with their own lawful spiritual leaders and to recognise the jurisdiction of the Roumanian state church. The ecclesiastical school autonomy, which our forefathers after long-continued conflicts had succeeded in winning out during the period of Turkish rule, was

annulled through brutal police measures. The Bulgarian schools and reading rooms were closed, and even their property confiscated in favour of the state. The Bulgarian teachers and priests were being persecuted, maltreated and exterminated. The Slavic tongue, used in the church services by the Bulgarians, was prohibited and supplanted by the Roumanian language, which the population did not understand. The images of the Bulgarian saints „St. Cyril and Methodius“ and „St. John Rilski“ were pulled down from the altars of the churches and thrown out. The Roumanian authorities at last crowned their mission of civilisation by an act which will do honour to no enlightened nation: on March 25, 1895, they burned down the richest library in the whole of Dobroudja — the library of the Bulgarian reading room „Concord“ in the city Toultcha.

The solemn promise of king Carol, to the effect that the property of the Dobroudja population will be protected by the Roumanian laws, was violated in just the way in which was that regarding the religious freedom. By law enacted on April 8, 1882, denominated „The Law for the Regulation of Real Estate Property in Dobroudja“¹⁾ all private lands, qualified by the Turkish legislation as lands „merié“ and owned by native people on the ground of regular Turkish documents (tapii), were declared to be state property. The private rights of possession, acquired during the period of Turkish rule, were annihilated. To the former owners of lands „mérie“ was only allowed the right, if desired, to repurchase them from the state and that under the condition that the Turkish documents were deemed acceptable by the Roumanian authorities. But few were those who could profit from that arrangement, since most of the Turkish documents through a partial

¹⁾ Legea pentru regularea proprietății imobiliare în Dobrogea

and arbitrary administrative examination were declared to be invalid. Something more: the documents of hundreds of owners of lands were destroyed outright, without any examination whatever. Moreover, all lands which the Turkish government had distributed among the Tartars, who had settled after the Crimean war in Dobroudja, were irrevocably and unconditionally appropriated by the state. In that manner the Roumanian state plundered thousands of hectars of land, fit for cultivation. Hundreds of agricultural families were robbed, left without any means for livelihood, thrown into misery, or forced to emigrate in America.¹⁾

The object pursued by this unhuman measure soon explained itself. Large areas of the plundered lands were sold at extremely low rates to several incomers from Roumania, who upon the ruined little husbandries founded large farms and introduced in the agricultural life of Dobroudja the Roumanian system of large farm-ownership-tchokois.

In the manifesto of the prince, dated November 14 1878, a promise was made that the Dobroudja inhabitants will be placed under the protection of the Roumanian constitution, that their civic position „will be placed on solid ground in a constitutional way“. This promise also was disregarded. During their domination of 38 years the Roumanians did not venture to apply the provisions of their constitution in Dobroudja. Instead of putting us under the promised protection, they subjected us to the pressure of an exclusive law — „The Law for the organisation of Dobroudja of March 9, 1880“,²⁾ whereby the most ele-

¹⁾ Ioan N. Roman. Dobrogea și drepturile politice ale locoitorilor ei. Constanța. 1905. p. 105.

²⁾ Legea pentru organizarea Dobrogei din 9. Martie 1880.

mentary constitutional principles were set at naught. What the nature of this law was will let the Roumanians themselves say. In 1880, when it was introduced into the senate and chamber for discussion, some of the most prominent parliamentary leaders¹⁾ censured it most severely, because they found it anti-liberal, that it does not take into consideration the most elementary human and civic rights, that it sanctions the surrender of parliamentary sovereignty into the hands of the administration, that thereby it commits a crime towards the Dobroudja population, that from the standpoint of statesmanlike policy therewith Roumania put herself lower than Bulgaria and Servia, which applied their constitutions in all their territories, acquired after the war of 1878. All these leaders were announcing, that they will vote against it, because „it does not take into consideration and does not treat the Dobroudja inhabitants as free citizens, but like an aggregation of slaves.“²⁾

The law for the organisation of Dobroudja did not accord political rights to the Dobroudja inhabitants, did not recognise their right to equality with the citizens of real Roumania, annulled the communal self-government, restricted the freedom of speech, press and public meetings and evolved all the favourable conditions for administrative arbitrariness and misdeeds. The political state of the Dobroudja inhabitants became much worse than that existing under the Turkish regime³⁾. We are flattering ourselves with the belief — says the Roumanian jurist Dr. Roman — that we have emancipated the people of Dobroudja from servitude, that we have rendered them free citizens. In reality the affairs do not appear in that light.

¹⁾ Pantazi—Ghica. Joan Jonescu de la Brad. D. J. Ghica. N. Fleva, General Manu, Joan Ghica, G. Cantili and others.

²⁾ See Dr. Joan N. Roman. Dobrodgea si drepturile politice ale locoitorilor ei. Constanta. 1905, p. 41.

In normal times the old inhabitants of Dobroudja had even under the Turks all the liberties and almost all the guarantees, which they are having now under the Roumanians. However, they had something more than they have under the Roumanians: they possessed equal rights with the other citizens of the Turkish Empire¹⁾. The annexation — says the French publicist Bellesort — attached to the people of Dobroudja the title of „Roumanian citizens“, but, if they have the misfortune of crossing over the Danubian bridge and attempt to assume that title, the Court of Cassation will tell them at once openly, that they do not possess the title and will demonstrate to them that, being Roumanian citizens in Dobroudja, outside of Dobroudja they are no longer Roumanian subjects, nor citizens, and that they are not reckoned within any known category.²⁾

The first sequence of the exclusive regime was the establishment of an arbitrary and an unscrupulous administration. „Dobroudja turned into a colony, in which the capricious officials were being exiled and the latter were given absolute liberty to rob the local population. No one took any interest in the economical, national and municipal problems. The administration became one of the worst. The political measures of the law for the organisation of Dobroudja were converted into administrative measures, into sources of countless oppressive tactics, abuses and all sorts of lawlessness. The prefect had become everything. He appointed mayors of towns and villages, alien to the localities — men from across the Danube, subjected the newspapers to persecution, altered and concocted the registers of electors and the elective colleges, expelled the lawyers, who, by virtue of the special law in regard to the

¹⁾ The same.

²⁾ Bellesort. A travers la Roumanie. *Revue des deux Mondes*
15. Mars 1905.

judicial organisation of Dobroudja, were left at the mercy of the prefects, filled the villages with his own favourite men, who infused fear and trembling among the population.¹⁾

Under the pressure of the strongly excited public opinion in Dobroudja and under the moral influence of the events, which gave a constitution to Turkey and political rights to Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Roumanian government in 1909 found itself compelled to enact a „Law for giving political rights to Dobroudja.“ However, the new law did not alter essentially the old situation; it did not displace the exclusive regime and the administrative dictatorship, created along with the organic law of 1880. To the Roumannian citizens political rights were given, but they were devoid of the conditions whereby they might avail themselves of these rights. A regime of political rights was instituted without the political freedom; a regime which placed the exercise of said political rights under the tutelage of the prefects, who, owing to the unchangeableness of the organic law, had reserved for themselves the unlimited power to appoint and dismiss the communal and district councils according to their own whims, to alter the elective registers and counties so as to suit their own interests, to appoint and discharge the mayors and councilmen, to suppress the right of free speech, the public press and meetings — in short, to stifle the will of the electors.²⁾ Therefore, the population of Dobroudja even after the enactment of the law of 1909 actually remained without any political rights and liberties.

Dobroudja was not unified and placed on a footing of equality with Roumania, so far as the constitution was

¹⁾ Vasile M. Kogalniceanu. Dobrogea 1879—1909. Drepturi politice fara libertati. 1910. p. 128, 129.

²⁾ Vasile M. Kogalniceanu. Dobrogea 1879—1909. Dreptuni politice fara libertati. Bucuresti. 1910. p. 255.

concerned. The causes for this injustice could readily be pointed out and explained. They have frequently been enumerated also in the debates of the Roumanian legislature. They had been clearly indicated also in the motives of almost all the exclusive laws with respect to Dobroudja. The Dobroudja population had to be Roumanised, its national self-consciousness had to be effaced, its spirit had to be crushed, before any civic or political rights and liberties were granted to it. In the motives regarding the law for the organisation of Dobroudja of 1880 it is expressly said: „The ultimate object of this law project was the complete assimilation of Dobroudja with Roumania“.¹⁾ The law, regulating real estate property in Dobroudja, whereby the lands of the Dobroudja population were taken away, was supported by its author M. Kogalnitchanu on February 27, 1882 in the chamber by means of arguments like these:

„Our chief interest is to populate, to civilise that part of Roumania; to populate it, I declare it, by giving it a Roumanian character, soul and sentiment; when I say that, you will understand, that we must urge many Roumanians to settle there permanently. Something more than that: the populations which are going thither of their own accord, we should strive in every possible manner to induce them to become Roumanians. Within several years we should force even the Mussulmans to become Roumanians.“²⁾

That was the object the Roumanians pursued with all their politico-social law-measures in Dobroudja; it was so with the suppression of the Church and educational freedom, it was so with the plunder of the private land property, it was so with the compulsory colonisation of Roumanian

¹⁾ The same. p. 115.

²⁾ The same. p. 29.

elements and it was so with all the violences and illegal acts, which they perpetrated against the local population.

6. To-day, in order to justify its new pretensions, Roumania affirms, that it had succeeded in attaching „Roumanian character and feelings“ upon the Dobroudja population. In order to demonstrate these assertions, it even adduces certain figures. The truth, however, is somewhat different: the Roumanians actually succeeded in „Roumanising“ Dobroudja, but only on writing paper, having marked into their statistics a large part of the Bulgarian population as being Roumanian. Moreover, we must note that the statistical figures, which are being given from Roumanian sources as to the nationality of the Dobroudja population, do not originate from the Roumanian Office for compiling statistics. In its annual reports, as well as in all its publications, the latter gives statistics as to the religious affiliations, citizenship, the family condition and literacy of the population in Roumania, but never in regard to its nationality. As far as we know, Roumania is the only state in Europe, which does not take part in the international convention for collecting statistical facts, conformably to which every one of the states which have subscribed thereto, should, by a definite and scientific method, collect and publish statistical facts also in regard to the language of its population.

The official Roumanian statistics in regard to the nationality of the population in Dobroudja hitherto have only been given in the annual reports of the prefects with the apparent political purpose of proving that Dobroudja, gradually, from day to day, is being Roumanised more and more.

The manner in which these statistics are being collected and compiled has nothing common with the all-accepted methods of the objective, strictly scientific statis-

tics. Its figures are derived from the municipal family registers, in which all the children born after the year 1878 in Dobroudja, are recorded as Roumanians, although their parents are of the Bulgarian nationality. We have at our disposal a series of official birth announcements, in which this open falsification of the truth can distinctly be discerned.

But even without having any recourse to the latter, the falsification in question could be proven through a comparison of statistical tables, which are being prepared and published in the annual reports of the Roumanian prefects in Dobroudja, commencing with the year 1880 till the year 1916. The same villages at various times in those tables are shown now as Roumanian, now as Bulgarian, now as Gagaouz, now as such of a mixed population, although within the same villages there had been no immigration, nor any emigration therefrom.

Even to the present time there exist no impartial statistical data in regard to the population of Dobroudja, on the basis of which fully objective conclusions could be deducted regarding the present ethnical aspect of that country. But if such data are not extant, there are sufficient facts, which eloquently and convincingly speak to the effect that the Dobroudja population in its large majority „neither feels nor breathes like the Roumanians.“ The fact that to the very last day of their domination in Dobroudja, the Roumanians governed the province through exclusive laws, that they never recognised the inhabitants of Dobroudja as citizens of equal rights with those of Roumania proper, that through the present war they drove to exile and misery as civil prisoners and hostages more than 25000 Dobroudja women, children, men and impotent old people, that they treated the Dobroudja population as inimical and perpetrated countless cruelties and atrocious deeds upon it, — this fact in itself most emphatically dis-

proves the veracity of all affirmations to the effect that Dobroudja is Roumanised, since, if it were actually so, these inhuman acts would have never been committed.

Moreover, the present Roumanian assertions are being denied also by the impartial refutations of several conscientious Roumanian publicists and learned men, who during the last twenty years brought forward before the Roumanian community in special scientific treatises the truth as to the character, the feelings, the desires and the aims of the population in Dobroudja. The Roumanian geographer Grigore Danescu in two of his comprehensive geographical, statistical and historical dictionaries regarding the districts of Toultcha and Kustendja — dictionaries which received prizes from the Roumanian Ministry of Education and the Religious Confessions as well as from the Roumanian Geographical Society — in describing the ethnography of Dobroudja, says:

„The Bulgarians had come earlier than the Roumanians. In the VII and VIII centuries they had settled down on the right bank of the Danube as far as the Black Sea. They constituted up to recent times the bulk of the population in the peninsula (Dobroudja is a peninsula E. N.) Their vocation is farming and that is one of the main sources for their enrichment. Their method of cultivating the soil is systematic and it may well be compared to that of the Germans, who are their only rivals in that province. Besides, it must be added that they are cattle-raisers, in which business they are particularly profficient.

The Bulgarians are rather indisposed towards the Roumanians, since they are still dreaming to see Dobroudja annexed to their fatherland Bulgaria. In their bearing towards the Roumanian authorities they are somewhat stubborn and unsubmissive, but the measures which were duly introduced warded off the alliance, which they

wanted to form with the other nationalities against the Roumanians, and forced them to be submissive and obedient."¹⁾

The jurist, G. N. Georgiu Burla, in a politico-social study writes: „Northern Dobroudja was under the influence of the Bulgarian population. The Bulgarians regarded themselves as being in their own state and had commenced to direct everything and to consider themselves as being the masters of the situation. Thus the registers of election, the municipal and district councils were 'being composed only of Bulgarians. All the officials were Bulgarians. The Bulgarian schools were being visited by numerous pupils and even by children of Roumanians. Patriotic committees were working openly for the slavonisation of Dobroudja."²⁾

7. Beside the employment of false statistics and groundless affirmations, contemporary official Roumania is trying to win the coöperation of Europe in order to impose again its domination over Dobroudja, by making use also of arguments of totally different nature. It points out, as an argument in favour of its pretensions, that its economical interests do require that it should have by all means an outlet into the Black Sea through the port of Kustendja. Removed from Dobroudja, it claims that Roumania would be deprived of such an outlet and its normal economical development would be impeded and blocked.

A mere glance on the map of Roumania and that of Dobroudja is sufficient to assure us, that this Roumanian assertion is equally as groundless as those, which we already considered. Roumania even without the port of Ku-

¹⁾ Grigora Gr. Danescu Dictionarul geografic, statistic si historic al județului Tulcea. 1896 p 521. — Dictionarul geographic, statistic, economic si historic al județului Costanta. Bucuresti. 1897, p. 265.

²⁾ G. N. Cheorghiu - Barla. Dobrogea 1898. p. 29.

stendja has an outlet to the sea through its two splendid Danubian ports-Galatz and Braila, which after the correction of the lower Danube have become accessible even for the largest steamers. The port of Kustendja has never played in the economic life of Roumania that role, which they are prone to ascribe to it. Even after its construction the larger part of the Roumanian export was being directed through the ports between Turnu-Severin and Galatz and forwarded by way of the Danube to other sea ports. Out of the entire Roumanian export only 25% is passing through Kustendja. The direct, cheap and convenient river route could never be fully supplanted by the expensive and inconvenient route Bucharest — Tcherna-voda — Kustendja. The circumstance that, till the construction of the Danubian bridge at Tcherna-voda, Roumania was being developed economically in a perfectly normal way, by utilising for its import and export almost exclusively its Danubian ports, shows that the port of Kustendja is not of vital necessity for that country, but a luxury, expiated by millions of francs, which, according to the testimony of prominent Roumanian economists, is not a paying proposition.¹⁾ Against this luxury many foreseeing Roumanians even as early as in 1878 and subsequently rebelled. The deputee N. B. Lacusteanu in 1878 declared: „We have the Danube, the navigation on which river is as free as that on the seas. And the state that has the antique Istros, is in contact with the sea. We, having that great artery, through it, without Mangalia; without Kustendja without the railway line Baraklei (the line Tcherna-voda—Kustendja), without the railway bridge, which is about to

¹⁾ See: a.-Gh. Christodorescu. Portul Constanta. 1909. b.-Christodorescu. Din noile porturi Constanta. c.-Christodorescu. Constanta, miscarea comerciala si maritima in 1905. d.-Paul Florinescu Portul Braila si importanta lui, 1911.

be constructed over the Danube, without the huge undertakings which will be attempted there and which will cost us millions of francs, without any benefit to ourselves; without the thousands of soldiers, which we must hold and without the military structures which we must erect there, we are in communication with the Black Sea and through it with the southern seas, with the ocean, with America, with the whole world."¹⁾

Roumania was impelled to construct the port of Kustendja and the Danubian bridge, not on account of imperative economical needs, but on account of certain political considerations. Through these two structures it aimed to justify and to perpetuate its rule in Dobroudja. That is clearly indicated in the reports, in connection with which in 1885 the legislative measures in regard to the two structures were introduced for discussion in the Roumanian parliament. In the exposition of the motives as to the construction of the Danubian bridge it is said: „We must connect the new Roumanian province with the mother country, so as to cause the disappearance of that partition, which divided us."²⁾

The same thought still more emphatically is expressed in the report in connection with the law-measure regarding the port of Kustendja. „As a political necessity, or rather as a power whose dominion extends over a seashore of 300 kilometers, we must establish our rule firmly and indisputably over that part of the shore along the Black Sea. The construction of the port and the Danubian bridge opens a new epoch for the well-being of Roumania and the era which decisively sanctions our rights of sovereignty along the shore of the Black Sea, from the mouth of the Danube up to the frontiers of Bulgaria. These structures will

¹⁾ NB. Lacusteanu, Dobrogea, Bucuresti, 1878, p. 26—27.

²⁾ See: Desbaterile Borpulilor Legiuitoare, 1885, p. 1549,

announce to the world that, having once established ourselves there, we are bound to remain there."¹⁾

The motives adduced demonstrate the complete fallacy of the main argument, whereby the Roumanians are now attempting to defend their claims over Dobroudja. But even if it were not so, even if Roumania had no other direct outlet to the sea by way of the Danube, still from the standpoint of international justice, in no way could it justify Roumanian domination over this province merely on the ground of its economical interests. The development of the international commercial relations during the past and the present century shows that the roads for economic expansiveness of every state could be fully guaranteed through mutual arrangements among the states, without sacrificing the freedom of one nation or another.

8. Against the Roumanian pretensions, no matter what they may be, we, the people of Dobroudja, bring forward our right to a free life, our interests, desires and aims. Under the insupportable Roumanian regime of 38 years, the free manifestation of our will was denied us, but our ideals and longings were not exterminated: we lived with the immovable hope, that sooner or later the chains of our spiritual and political servitude will be broken, and the sun of liberty will shine forth brightly over our long suffering native land as well. That is the reason why, with boundless enthusiasm, with widely open arms, we greeted the Bulgarian troops of liberation, together with those of their allies. In their bloody effort, crowned with glory and victories, we saw the realisation of our most cherished dream. Free to-day, we — the people of Dobroudja — raise high our voice in order to show the whole world our desires and our aspirations. We raise our voice in protest

¹⁾ The same 1541—1544.

against every new attempt to thrust upon us the abominable Roumanian domination and to declare that we are ready, even with arms in hand, to defend our rights and liberties from every and any foreign encroachment, which might venture to render our native land a highway to imperialistic usurpations.

The Roumanian rule was to us a symbol of lawlessness, arbitrariness and oppression. In future it will be the source of new wrongs and a cause for new commotions and conflicts within the Balkans — conflicts which most assuredly will transform our native land into a theatre of new desolations, ravages and miseries.

The sufferings, which the wars during the last three centuries caused us, were more than sufficient. We drank the bitter cup of life to the bottom. That is quite. We crave for peace, liberty and justice. We want favourable conditions and sure guarantees for a peaceable economic, intellectual and political development. In the course of the past 30 years Roumania did not vouchsafe them to us; it will not accord them to us in the future either, and, as in the past, our fatherland will be for it a kind of Siberia, an expedient market not for its commerce, for its grain products, timber, and oil wealth, but an opening for the superfluous number of its outcast farming elements, through the compulsory transmigration of whom, the Roumanian governments have always aimed to procrastinate the solution of the precarious agrarian question and to prolong the regime of oppression which has come down to the people from the middle ages and under which even to this day the industrious, but very unfortunate, Roumanian peasant is groaning hopelessly.

9. We, the people of Dobroudja, without any distinction as to faith or nationality, insistently demand that we remain within the bounds of Bulgaria, because in the Bul-

garian rule we see indisputable guarantees in regard to our civic and political rights of equality, as well as a possibility to determine the mode of government without any outside interference; under Bulgarian domination we believe that we will find all the necessary conditions for an undisturbed economic and educational growth. And our faith is not founded upon a mere prejudice or upon a casual suggestion, but upon the proofs which Bulgaria gave in its own political life from the day in which the Berlin congress convened to the present time. While all of us in Dobroudja were disheartened under the oppression of the exclusive Roumanian regime, transformed into a herd of voiceless slaves, while our property was being plundered through unjust laws, while our church and school liberties were trampled down, while all civil and political equality was denied us, in Bulgaria all citizens, irrespective of nationality and faith, were enjoying the broadest civil, political and religious liberties and rights. Bulgaria's flag was for all its citizens a flag of broad democracy and social justice.

Its constitution, totally democratic, with general voting franchise in accordance with the proportional elective system, affords ample possibility to all citizens to take part most actively in the politico-social life of the country, guarantees to them all the prerequisites for a peaceful economic and intellectual progress. Its economic organisation, grounded on the proportional distribution of the working land among the national masses, secures to everyone a tolerable and a free existence.

The bitter experience of the past convinced and assured us that we cannot expect these benefits from Roumania, whose economic and social organisation is an absolute denial of every conception of right, freedom and justice. It may perhaps be alleged that, after this war,

Roumania will be reformed, that the Great Powers will force it to vouchsafe the rights and liberties of its own subjects. But it should be remembered that the Powers even in 1878 had imposed upon it that obligation as an essential condition in order to recognise its independence. Did Roumania fulfil it? The civic and political position of the Jews beyond the Danube and of all the nationalities in Dobroudja from the time of the Berlin congress to the present day is the most eloquent reply.

And just that reply is telling us that the return of the Roumanian domination in Dobroudja should under no condition and in no case be permitted, not only for the well-being of the Bulgarians, but also for the welfare of all nationalities, which inhabit that province.

10. Dobroudja, by nature separated from Roumania, Bulgarian by way of history, geographic location, population, name, desires and aims, could not become Roumanian through false statistics, through historic legends, through artificial economic entanglements, through forced emigration, through compulsory colonisation, through an abduction and extermination of its peaceable population; because, in the present age of sublime conflicts in behalf of justice and liberty, these arbitrary tactics of the middle ages could not transform the violences committed into right actions, since these violent acts are in direct opposition to the principle of justice and of the right of the nations to a free life; because no authority forcibly imposed on a land, despite the will of its population, has ever anywhere attained the prerogative of an immovable historic prescription. To-day the nations are not the property of any one. In conformity to the sacred human rights, they belong to themselves, and they alone have the right to determine their own political destiny.

In the name of these principles and in harmony with the formula „peace without annexations“, proclaimed by the Russian revolution, we insistently pray the representatives of the states, who are called upon to establish a just peace among the nations:

1. To announce the separation of Dobroudja from Roumania and
2. To recognise the accomplished fact — our political union with Bulgaria, which shed the precious blood of thousands of its own sons, in order to put an end to the sufferings and anarchy in our native land.

Dobroudja is a Bulgarian land and it should remain Bulgarian forever.

City of Babadag, January 7, 1918.

The Dobroudja National Council.

President: Dr. Iv. Ognenoff.

Vice-Presidents: Nikola Stoeff, Ivan Stancheff.

General Secretary: Ant. Barlakoff.

Councilmen: Dragomir Pachoff, Christo Popoff, Dim. Nichoff, Dimitr Neikoff, Dr. Ivan Penakoff, Slavi Drenovski, N. Kotaroff, T. Rakidjieff, Salim Hasan, Nedjib Demerdjian, Islam Arif Said, Hussein Suleman.

SUPPLEMENT No. 1.

RESOLUTION.

Of the assembly of representatives of the Bulgarian villages and cities, which was passed with acclamations in its session of December 17, 1917.

The assembly of the representatives of the Dobroudja villages and cities, having interchanged thoughts upon the past and present political destiny of Dobroudja and having taken into consideration :

1. That the whole of Dobroudja, as far as the mouth of the Danube, in its geographic position, in its history and population constitutes an inseparable part of the general Bulgarian country; that from the very foundation of the Bulgarian state in 679, sanctioned through written treaty between the Bulgarian prince Asparuh and the By-santine emperor Constantine IV Pogonat, till 1878 this Balkan province, even in its days of servitude, as well as in its days of freedom, has been sharing the common political destiny of Bulgaria;

2. That the Turkish conquerors of the Balkans at the end of the 14-th century wrested Dobroudja from its last possessor the Bulgarian prince Ivanko, the son of Dobrotich, who gave his own name to the entire province;

3. That through the Turkish domination of five centuries Dobroudja was being colonised with Mussulman and other nationalities, but notwithstanding that it did not lose its Bulgarian character;

4. That after the Russo-Turkish wars at the end of the 14-th century and the beginning of the 19-th century, which devestated, ruined and unpeopled the whole of Dobroudja, the expelled Bulgarian population in the direction of the Balkans returned in compact masses within their

ruined native hearths and, through their creative labour and boundless energy ennobled the wasted fields and reproduced its most valuable treasures;

5. That even in the first days of the Bulgarian awakening, initiated in the beginning of the past century, the Bulgarians of Dobroudja with their well-ordered churches, schools, economic and educational corporations actively participated in the struggles for the spiritual and political independence of the united Bulgarian nation and, thanks to their supremacy, became the chief directing factor in the social, intellectual and economic life of the province;

6. That the Bulgarian character of Dobroudja was recognised with the Sultan's decree for the establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate, issued on March 12, 1870, as well as by the Constantinople Conference of the representatives of the Great Powers in 1876;

7. That the Berlin congress in 1878 gave Dobroudja to Roumania, not because the latter had any rights over that province, but because it believed that thereby it will guarantee the freedom of navigation along the lower Danube and it will create a check to the aggressive aims of imperial Russia in the Near East;

8. That in the present great war Roumania did not fulfil the obligations, which the Great European Powers had imposed upon it in 1878, that it deserted its post as a "guardian of the Danube," it became a conductor of the Russian imperialistic schemes in the Balkans and caused the ruins and desolation in that part of the world and hurled into unheard of miseries and sufferings thousands of innocent families in Dobroudja;

9. That the Roumanians in 1878 acknowledged of their own accord that Dobroudja does not belong to them, whether viewed from an ethnographic, historic or geographical standpoint and for that reason they did not wish

to receive it, a circumstance which is readily proven by the decision of the Roumanian Senate and Chamber on January 26, 1878, as well as the Memoir of the Roumanian Government, submitted to the protecting Powers of the Danubian principalities on March 9, 1878, and finally the declarations of the Roumanian plenipotentiary, Mihail Kogalnitchanu, made in the session of the Berlin Congress on July 1, 1878, Protocol No. 10, besides numerous other official and authoritative Roumanian communications;

10. That during their rule of 38 years in Dobroudja the Roumanian governments did not fulfil the promises, which were solemnly given to the Dobroudja population by the late king Carol in his manifesto of November 26, 1878; that they subjected the Dobroudja inhabitants to an insupportable administrative police regime, denying the most elementary human, civic and political liberties and rights, disregarded the law of equal rights for all citizens, which was applied loyally under the Turkish domination, forcibly appropriated the larger part of the lands, which belonged to the original Dobroudja population and distributed them among the Roumanian colonists, who were brought from the other side of the Danube, encroached upon the religious freedom of the Bulgarians as schismatics, having forced them to renounce their own autonomous national church and to accept the jurisdiction of the Roumanian state church;

11. That through the present war Roumania demonstrated once more in an indubitable manner its inimical relations towards Dobroudja, wholly foreign to it, by deporting into exile and peril more than 25000 innocent women, men, children and old people of Dobroudja;

12. That the Dobroudja population with joy greeted the Bulgarian troops and their allies, as carriers of freedom and justice and in their blood sacrifice saw its treasured

dream realised — viz., its spiritual and political liberation from the unbearable Roumanian oppression;

13. That the return of the Roumanian domination in Dobroudja will constitute one of those unpardonable acts of injustice, for the removal of which to-day humanity is shedding its blood and will become a cause for new commotions and conflicts, whereby the Dobroudja population will again be forced to suffer, having already experienced the indescribable terrors of the wars, which during the last three centuries had been laying waste its native land;

14. That the Dobroudja population, regardless of religion and nationality, under Bulgarian government will have the broadest civic and political liberties and rights, such as are afforded to all citizens in Bulgaria, and under the protection of the Bulgarian democratic constitution it will have all the prerogatives for a free educational, political and economic development;

15. That Dobroudja now belongs to its population, and that, in accordance with the principle of the free self-determination of nationalities, it has the unquestionable juridical and moral right to direct its future political destiny;

16. That Dobroudja should not be made a coin of exchange for foreign egoistical and imperialistic encroachments, because its population could not and should not any longer be treated as a herd of slaves; having taken into consideration all the above, the Assembly unanimously.

RESOLVED:

1. Demands the speedy annexation of entire Dobroudja as far as the mouth of the Danube to Bulgaria.
2. Declares that the Dobroudja population will not permit [the return of the Roumanian domination on this

side of the Danube and will fight even with arms in hand against any foreign intrusion and encroachment upon its rights and liberties.

3. Appeals to the Bulgarian Government and to the entire Bulgarian nation to support and defend the just cause of Dobroudja.

4. Requests all nations and all representatives of the states, who may be called together to establish peace among the belligerent nations, to have in view the persistent demands of the Dobroudja population and on the basis of these should determine its future political destiny.

5. The Dobroudja Central National Council is charged to prepare, in the spirit of the present resolution, a minute Memoir and should submit it, through a special delegation, to the neutral and the belligerent states.

The Bureau of the Dobroudja National Council.

(Signed) President: Dr. Ivan Ognyanoff.

Vice-Presidents: Angel Lioutskanoff, Stantcho Marinoff, Sava Dobreff, Salim Hassan, Stoyan H. Nikoloff.

Secretaries: Vasil Tchobanoff, Peter Sivkoff, Todor Rakidjieff, Ivan Vassileff.

Here follow the signatures of all the delegates from the villages and cities of Dobroudja:

City of Kustendja

M. Nitcheff,
Peter Gandeff,
Chr. B. Donkoff.

Village of Karaorman

(Kustendja district)

D. Lazaroff.

Vil. Bogdanli Tchamurli

(Dobritch Dis.)

Jeliou Dimitroft,
Iv. Paskaleff,
K. Petroff.

Vil. Bash-kyoi

(Tultcha Dis.)

Kraliou Kostoff,

Yanaki Popoff,
Grigor Dimitroff.

Vil. Ak-Kadun.

Halit Saduk,
Ibraim Kadir.

City of Babadag.

Salim Hassan,
Ivan J. Ivanoff,
Nediou Tsankoff,
Iv. Christoff,
Peter Kazailieff,
Mussein Suleimanoff,
Ab. M. Pinj,
Maria Todorova,
Elissaveta Obreshkova.

City of Kavarna.

Chr. Stoytcheff,
S. M. Ratchkoff.

City of Baltchik.

Al. Lioudskanoff.

Vil. Giaour Souioutchouk
(Baltchik Dis.)

Manol Popoff,
R. Nikoff,
Karo Koleff.

Vil. Kara-Nassouff,
(Kustendja Dis.)

M. Boyadjieff,
D. Mihaleff,
Iv. Peteff.

Vil. Emeshanli
(Ostrova Dfs.)

Vassil Petroff.

Vil. Gorno Dobromir
(Siliстра Dis.)

Jeliou Gergeff.

Vil. Anadolkyoi
(Rustendja Dis.)

Nikola Nakeff.

Vil. Armutlia
(Tultcha Dis.)

N. Petkoff,
G. Dimitrakeff,
Ashim Omeroff.

Vil. Saru-Nasouf
(Tultcha Dis.)

G. Paskaleff,
K. Stoeff,
S. Dimitroff,
L. Abdurmanoff,
Iv. Yordanoff.

Vil. Rassouvat
(Kustendja Dis.)

Chr. Dinkoff.

Vil. Frikatsei
(Tultcha Dis.)

T. Mitaleff.
Yashar Omer.

Vil. Dokouzolo

(Medjidié Dis.)

Georgi Yordanoff.

Vil. Kozgoun

Georgi Antonoff.

Vil. Touzla

(Kustendja Dis.)

M. Varbanoff,
Yordan Vassileff.**Vil. Kasapkyoi**

(Kustendja Dis.)

Stantcho D. Marinoff,
Mihail Kareff.**Vil. Kongaz**

(Tultcha Dis.)

St. H. Nikoloff,
St. D. Manolski,
Yor. Stoyanoff.**Vil. Potour**

(Tultcha Dis.)

S. G. Stoyanoff,
Georgi T. Jeleff.**Vil. Topogyol**

(Tultcha Dis.)

A. Makedonski,
Ismail Feizula,
Osman Bekir.**Vil. Gorna Saradja**

(Dobritch Dis.)

Dr. V. Bel . . .

Vil. Kara Mourat

(Dobritch Dis.)

S. Bash.

Vil. Enidje Haidar

(Dobritch Dis.)

G. Christeff,
K. Ivanoff.**Vil. Pashu Kashlu**

(Tultcha Dis.)

L. Shishmanoff.

Vil. Islaym Djaferka

(Tultcha Dis.)

I. Damyanoff.

City of IsatchkaChr. Nedeff,
V. Ivanoff,
Todor Dontcheff,
Stefan Mitakoff.**Vil. Dolnia Tchamourlia**

(Tultcha Dis.)

M. G. Popoff,
K. G. Donkoff,
Dimitr Atanassoff.**Vil. Poshta**

(Tultcha Dis.)

Y. G. Natcheff,
F. Nikitoff,
M. T. Pantcheff.

Vil. Karaatch-Koula
(Kustendja Dis.)

D. Slavoff.

Vil. Koupouktchii
(Kustendja Dis.)

T. Atanassoff.

Vil. Gorna Tchamoula
(Tultcha Dis.)

Georgi Georgeff.

Vil. Malik Gargalik
(Kustendja Dis.)

B. Kolleff,

J. Raynoff.

Vil. Peletlia
(Kustendja Dis.)

Mihal Staikoff.

Vil. Dolen Irtmlik
(Küstendja Dis.)

N. Atanassoff.

Vil. Kassimtcha
(Kustendja Dis.)

Iv. Lazaroff.

Vil. Beydaoud
(Kustendja Dis.)

K. II. Pentchoff,

G. Kovatcheff.

T. Borlakoff.

Vil. Sarikyoi
(Tultcha Dis.)

K. Maksimoff,
Egor Platenoff,
Vassil S. Kiroff,
S. Todoroff.

Vil. Hamandjii
(Tultcha Dis.)

Peter Vassileff.

Vil. Ortakoi
(Tultcha Dis.)

Peter Petroff,
Youssein Alisheff.

Toutrakan
and the County.

P. Mavrodinoff,
T. Tchiplakoff.

Vil. Bulgar. Sari-Gyol.
(Kustendja Dis.)

T. E. Bobeff.

The city of Tultcha.

Dragomir Patchoff,
Iv. Sindjerlieff,
Angel Savoff,
Iv. Kovanoff,
V. Assenoff,
K. M. Stoyanoff,
P. M. Bizoff,
D. M. Nikoloff,

D. Skotchkoff,
A. Iv. Borlakoff,
Nikola Stoeff,

Vil. Tourkoya
(Tultcha Dis.)

T. V. Tontcheff,
Radi Dobreff,
Constantine Stantcheff,
Nedelko Manoloff,
Nikola Kirinkin.

Vil. Kardjilar
(Tultcha Dis.)

Vas. N. Gergieff,
Vassil Markoff.

Vil. Hassanlar
(Tultcha Dis.)

Edem Suleimanoff.

Vil. Omourlar

V. Bari,
Mustafa Feizuli.

Vil. Ak Bounar
(Tultcha Dis.)

Jeliu Raitcheff,
V. Atanassoff.

Vil. Tchokourovo
(Tultcha Dis.)

Nahani Unpicht,
Frider. Bazandervisech,
Fredrich Fsaïs,

D. Erzans,
Assan Kirimoff.

Vil. Eski-Baba
(Tultcha Dis.)

Vultcho Roleff,
Dimitr Ivanoff.

City of Mangalia

K. Nikoloff,
Mihail Kourteff.

Vil. IlanInk
Kustendja Dis.)

Peter Jekoff.

Vil. Gretchi
-Tultcha Dis.-

D. Christoff,
Vassil Filoff.

Vil. Balabantcha

Ahmed Ismailoff,
Yakob Moissoff.

Vil. Alifak
(Tultcha Dis.)

Mihail Satchkoff.

Vil. Uzlar
Dobritch Dis.)

Chr. Dimitroff.

City of Tcherna-Voda
Peter M. Gradinaroff.

Vil. Kanli-Boudjak

(Tuitcha Dis.)

St. Todoroff,
Veliko Surboff,
Iv. Mitoff.

Vil. Slava Tcherkeza

(Tultcha Dis.)

T. Oziroff,
Angelia Gerassimoff,
Ivan Drovtscheff.

Vil. Kamber

(Tultcha Dis.)

Yordan Ivanoff,
N. Nikoloff,
S. Ivanoff,
N. Entcheff.

Vil. Dourbalii

(Dobritch Dis.)

Nedeff,
Dr. Atanassoff,
G. Beikoff.

Vil. Topra Hissar

(Kustendja Dis.)

Stefan Hadji Vassileff,
Abdilah H. Hodur Ali.

Vil. Essetlii

(Dobritch Dis.)

Mihni Ioveff.

Vil. Phanta Nedelei

(Mathin Dis.)

Nikola M. Tchenkoff,
Veliko G. Kristeff.

Vil. Karanuk

(Silistra Dis.)

Stefan Petkoff.

Vil. Kavgadjii

(Tultcha Dis.)

Ivan Georgoff.

Vil. Kalika

(Tultcha Dis.)

Dimitr S. Dimitroff,
Ivan Kapoudjia,
Ivan Pope Mikoff.

Vil. Hadji Gyol

(Tultcha Dis.)

Illia Stoyanoff,
Iv. Savoff.

Vil. Sari Gyol

(Tultcha Dis.)

Marin Neitcheff,
Neitcho P. Netcheff,
Nikolai Dobroudjanoff.

City of Mahmoudia

Peter St. Kaltcheff,
P. Christeff.

Vil. Dolni Dounavetz
(Tultcha Dis).

Sava Ivanoff,
Dimo Ivanoff,
Ivan Yakoff.

Vil. Morougyol
(Tultcha Dis).

Iv. T. Savoff,
Yakov Babenkoff,
Feodor Houssarenkoff.

Vil. Gorni Dounavetz
(Tultcha Dis).

Smenn Hussarenkoff.

Vil. Karamankyoi
(Tultcha Dis).

Peter Andreeff,
Georgi H. Jelyoff.

Vil. Kamenka
(Tultcha Dis).

Ev. Evtimoff,
R. S. Petouhoff,
As. Petouhoff.

Vil. Yaila
(Tultcha Dis).

Simon Daniloff,
Mustafa Soulish.

Vil. Anamdja
(Tultcha Dis).

Penyo Trandafiloff.

Vil. Telitsa
(Tultcha Dis).

A. I. Govedarski,
T. Mironoff,
N. Stoyanoff.

Vil. Enissala
(Tultcha Dis).

Atanas Christoff,
I. M. Ilieff.

Vil. Assirlik
(Dobritch Dis).

Kiro Koeff.

Vil. Kirishlik
(Kustendja Dis).

Iv. Dimoff.

Vil. Toksof

V. Petroff,
Youmer Kut Molla.

Vil. Testimel
(Kustendja Dis).

Mito Nikoloff.

Vil. Zibil
(Tultcha Dis).

Georgi Todoroff,
Vassil Atanassoff.

Vil. Tcherna
(Tultcha Dis).

Nikola Popoff,
Petco Petroff,
Radi Peneff.

City of Matchin

T. Gabrovski,
 S. Rustemoff,
 Riza Mehmedoff,
 Dimitr Handjieff.

Vil. Douyundjii

(Kustendja Dis.).

Novi Kristeff
 Georgi Viltcheff,
 Tchemshi Alieff,
 Atem Mehmedoff.

Vil. Jijila

(Tultcha Dis.).

Gitsa Aleku Korintchanu,
 Retrake Vassileff,
 Nikola Brejau.

Vil. Nalbant

(Tultcha Dis.).

Entcho S. Doneff,
 Andrei Markoff.

Vil. Tristenik

(Tultcha Dis.).

Georgi Doneff,
 Ali Assan Hodja,
 Mehmed Ali Mourel.

Vil. Ihan Tcheshme

(Tultcha Dis.).

Dimitr Minkoff.

Vil. Tounkavitsa

(Tultcha Dis.).

P. Georgoff,
 T. Andonoff.

Vil. Megdankyoi

(Tultcha Dis.).

Stoyan Peneff,
 Mihu Geneff.

Vil. Dolni Dobromir

(Silistra Dis.).

Ganyou Robeff.

Vil. Almalii

Ivan Dimoff.

Vil. Koyoudjouk

(Dobritch Dis.).

R. Vassileff.

City of Ostrov

N. Petroff,
 P. Nedelkoff.

Vil. Essekoyi

(Dobritch Dis.).

T. Toporoff.

Vil. Golem Garvan

(Silistra Dis.).

Yordan Dimitroff,

Vil. Girlitsa

(Silistra Dis.).

Peter Dragonoff.

Vil. Galitsa

(Siliстра Dis.)

G. Petroff.

Vil. Kanlli

(Siliстра Dis.)

Sava Dobreff.

Vil. Kokardja

(Siliстра Dis.)

Peter Nikoloff,

Z. Rangeloff.

Vil. Alibeikyoi

(Tultcha Dis.)

St. Nikoloff,

Stoiko Ilieff.

Vil. Gyol Bounar

(Kustendja Dis.)

Dimitr D. Doneff.

Vil. Gyaour Souyutchuk

(Baltchik Dis.)

R. Nikoloff;

K. Koleff,

Manol Popoff.

Vil. Adam Klisse

(Kustendja Dis.)

Georgi Dimitroff.

Vil. Tchineli

(Tultcha Dis.)

Dobri Stefanoff.

City of Medjidié

Petr Miteff,

Argyr Christoff,

Nikolai Mirtcheff,

Sadik Suleimanoff.

Vil. Hantcharka

(Tultcha Dis.)

Kristo Stankoff,

Parfenti Ivanoff,

Aksenti Simeonoff.

Vil. Petchenega

(Tultcha Dis.)

M. Dontcheff,

Kyro Koleff,

Ivatcho Panoff.

Vil. Ai Orman

(Tultcha Dis.)

Iv. Militaroff,

Marin Skarlatoff.

Dobri Radoff,

Mihail Sarboff,

N. Sfefanoff.

Vil. Beshtepé

(Tultcha Dis.)

Dimitr Petroff,

Vassil Ivanoff,

Gergi Penkoff,

Ilia Marinoff,

Denyu Vassiloff.

Vil. Nikolitsel
(Tultcha Dis.)

B. T. Bogdanoff,
N. Tsontcheff.

Vil. Epikyoi
(Tultcha Dis.)

Vassil Jeleff,
Atanas Dimitroff,
Iv, Kozaroff.

Vil. Lipnitsa.
(Tultcha Dis.)

N. Tesheff,
Angel N. Tsonkoff.

Vil. Parakyoi
(Kustendja Dis.)

Kolyo Roussanoff.

Vil. Hadjilar
(Tultcha Dis.)

Georgi Dimitroff,
S. Koutsaroff.

**The representatives of the
Dobroudja Emigration —
city of Varna**

A. Kotaroff,
Vassil Sivkoff.

City of Dobritch

Kosta Patcheff,
A. Hasseff,
Hassan Bei A. Beyeff,
Ivan Vassileff.

**The representative of the
Dobroudja Emigration —
Sofia**

Dr. Todor Todoroff.

DOBROUDJA. The annexation of Dobroudja to Roumania is now confirmed. It is
decided to make a special arrangement for the protection of the people of Dobroudja
and the right of self-government is granted to the inhabitants of Dobroudja. The
Government of Roumania has issued a special decree for the protection of the people of Dobroudja.

SUPPLEMENT No 2.

A translation from the Bulgarian text of the manifesto
issued by Prince Carol I on November 14 — 1878 and
directed to the inhabitants of Dobroudja in regard to
the annexation of Dobroudja.

CAROL I.

With the mercy of God and the national will autocrat
of the Roumanian nation — to all of the present and of
the future — greeting.

Inhabitants of Dobroudja!

The great European powers through the Berlin treaty
annexed your country to Roumania.

We do not enter within your bounds fixed by Europe
as conquerors; but it is well known to you also that much
Roumanian blood was shed for the liberation of the na-
tions on the right bank of the Danube.

Inhabitants of every nationality and faith!

Dobroudja, belonging from ancient times to Mirtcho
the Old and to the Great Stefan, from this day constitutes
a part of Roumania. From now on you are depending
upon a Government which decides and directs not through
arbitrary means and methods, but through a law which
is studied and approved by the nation.

The holiest and the most precious human gifts, such
as life, honour and property are placed under the defence

of a Constitution, for which many nations are envious. Your faith, your families and the thresholds of your abodes will be protected by the our laws and no one will dare violate them without receiving due punishment therefor.

Mussulman inhabitants!

The Roumanian sense of justice does not discriminate in respect to nationality or religion. Your religion, your families will be safeguarded on the same footing as those of the Christians. Your religious and family affairs as regards yourselves will be entrusted to Muftis and Judges selected by people of your own nationality and faith. And thus you Christians and you Mussulmans may with confidence greet the Roumanian authorities, for they are coming with the only object to put an end to those sad trials which you experienced and to heal the wounds which the war inflicted upon you, to defend the person, your property and your lawful interests and finally to develop your moral and material well-being.

The Roumanian troops which are entering into Dobroudja have no other appointment but to preserve the order, to give an example for good discipline and to defend your peaceful life. And thus greet with love the Roumanian flag, which to you will prove a flag of freedom, a flag of justice and peace.

Within a short time your country will receive, by means of the Constitution, the required training, which will provide for all your wants and guard your morality, by putting on a solid basis your existence as citizens. Till that time it will devolve upon the Roumanian authorities to ascertain and satisfy your needs and customs, to secure your welfare, to cause you to love the country with whose destiny your destiny is also identical.

(Herein follow enumerated the reforms in the tax system, which are introduced „as a proof of our parental care for you;“ the taxes for 1889 which were to be paid by products will be paid by cash; the tax on real-estate, on taverns, coffee-houses etc. will also be paid by cash, while the tax for liberation from military service will be entirely removed.)

And thus invoking the blessing of the Almighty God, in the name and with the consent of Europe, to-day we take into our possession Dobroudja, which again becomes Roumanian land and sending you our Sovereign greeting, express our desire that this day for this new part of Roumania should mark the beginning for peace and advancement, the beginning of well-being and brotherly love among the sons of the one and the same country.

Issued in Braila, November 14 in the year of God's grace 1878 and of our reign 13-th.

CAROL.

President of the Ministerial Council
Minister of Agriculture, Commerce,
Public Affairs and for the Minister of the Ecclesiastical Affairs, I. K. Bratianu.

Minister of Foreign Affairs: M. Kogalnitchanu.

Minister of the Interior Affairs: K. A. Rossetti.

Minister of Finance: I. Kampianu.

Minister of Justice: E. Statesku.

SUPPLEMENT № 3.

DECLARATION

OF

THE DOBROUDJA CENTRAL NATIONAL COUNCIL.

The Bucharest peace deferred the just solution of the Dobroudja question and placed in it a new crisis. The people of Dobroudja firmly believed, that their desires and aspirations, expressed clearly and distinctly in the resolutions of the Dobroudja National Assembly on December 16 and 17 1817, that their rights for political and spiritual freedom, expiated through struggles and sufferings in the course of many ages, will be honoured and unconditionally recognised in the treaty of Bucharest on May 7, 1918. They were hoping that with respect to their native land also the loudly proclaimed principle as to the free self-determination of nations will be applied, as was the political destiny of Litva, Kourlandia, Estlandia, Poland and Ukraina fixed at Brest-Litovsk and on the basis of which vanquished Roumania, through the tacit acknowledgement of the Bucharest Conference, occupied and annexed the whole of Bessarabia. Turkey to-day, on the basis of the same principle, demands the political independence of Crimea and Caucasus, although in relation to Dobroudja it impedes its complete application.

With profound regret now the people of Dobroudja are noticing that their hopes, supported and nurtured by ceaseless and solemn promises, both on the part of the Bulgarian government, and on the part of the responsible

German and Austro-Hungarian political factors, remain unrealised. In Bucharest their will was ignored. Dobroudja anew was split into parts and was treated as an object of plunder, partition and ransom, as a material for politico-economical agreements and speculations, as it was treated even by the Russian imperialism during the year 1878.

Opposed to this crying injustice, opposed to this undeserved pernicious solution, which the right of force, and not the force of right is imposing upon them, the Dobroudja Central National Council in the name of all the people in Dobroudja is raising its voice of protest and, reminding all the states and nations of the decisions of the Dobroudja National Assembly, which insistently demanded the speedy union of entire Dobroudja with Bulgaria, — reiterates that the struggle for the full and unconditional freedom of that country, which it has undertaken, will not cease until the will of the Dobroudja population is satisfied.

Relying on its own immovable faith in the might of the national rights, the Council esteems it its duty to emphasise the circumstance, that the starting principle, which imperatively forces itself as a basis for a just solution of the Dobroudja question, is not the interests of this or that state, but the rights, desires and the aspirations of the population, which inhabits the province, whose future destiny is about to be determined.

Before it could appertain to any one state whatsoever, Dobroudja belongs to its own population, which with an untiring labour created and creates its most valuable riches. Without its consent no one has any right, without being classed as an intruder, to determine the political possession of its own native land. It is the only master of its destinies, and every disregard of its inalienable rights

and of its will constitutes a violent encroachment upon the juridical foundations, on which the international concord, peace and public morality are resting.

Every act, agreement or treaty, imposed or contracted by whomsoever it may be, if it were in conflict with these principles, is without any juridical force and obligatoriness for the population, whose will is being ignored or suppressed.

City of Babadag, June 4 — 1918.

The Dobroudja Central National Council:

President: Dr. Iv. Ognyanoff.

Vice-Presidents: Nikola Stoeff, Ivan Stantcheff.

**Members: Dr. Patcheff, D. Dimoff, D. Neikoff,
Sl. Drenovski, Dr. Iv. Penakoff, N. Je-
leff, M. Vulkoff, Salim Hassan, Ned-
jib Demirdjian, Isliam Arif Said,
Hus. Suleiman.**

SUPPLEMENT № 4.

THE RESOLUTION
OF THE SECOND DOBROUDJA NATIONAL ASSEMBLY,
voted with acclamation in its session of September
23 — 1918.

The Second Assembly of the representatives from the Dobroudja villages and cities in its session on September 23—1918, having discussed the situation, created for Dobroudja by reason of the Bucharest peace of May 7—1918, and having listened to declarations of the Bulgarian, Russo-Lipovan, Turco-Tartar, German and Roumanian groups, composed of delegates, took into consideration the following:

1. The Bucharest peace eliminated the just solution of the Dobroudja question, by ignoring the will and the political aims of the Dobroudja population, expressed in the resolution of the First Dobroudja National Assembly of December 17—1917, and disregarded the solemn promises made to the people of Dobroudja both on the part of Bulgaria and on the part of the responsible circles of the Central Powers.

2. The Bucharest peace violated the contemporary international principles concerning justice, equity and the free self-determination of the nationalities, so that, in order to satisfy alien projects and interests, divided Dobroudja and its population and turned them into an object of ransom and exchange, of politico-economical agree-

ments and speculations, which carry us back to the epoch of feudalism and slavery. It reaffirmed the injustice which was done towards the Dobroudja population with art. 19 of the San Stefano treaty and art. 46 of the Berlin treaty.

3. The division of Dobroudja could not be justified whether viewed from a geographic, historical or ethnographic standpoint, or even from the standpoint of the interests, desires and the political aims of the Dobroudja population. Dobroudja by way of its geographic position, by way of history, by way of the ethnical composition of its population, by way of its educational and economic ties and by way of its political aspirations, is an indivisible province. The division into a Northern and a Southern Dobroudja is arbitrary and could only be explained through an interposition of foreign imperialistic aggressions and interests.

4. The condominium, forced on Northern Dobroudja through the Bucharest treaty, carries with it new, heavy burdens and trials for the population. It is a forerunner of new commercial and political agreements and speculations at the expense of the future political destiny of the population in Dobroudja.

5. The just solution of the Dobroudja question depends neither upon the creation of a separate autonomous state from Dobroudja, nor upon the return of the Roumanian domination within it. Dobroudja as an autonomous state will become an apple of discord among the neighbours, a place for rivalry amidst foreign imperialistic encroachments and influences and a road of new incursions and bloody conflicts from which the interests of the population in Dobroudja will have to suffer.

Dobroudja under Roumanian domination will be, as during the past 38 years, again a land for plunder, for injustices, for arbitrary acts, for political and spiritual servitude. The bitter experience of the past firmly convinced all the nationalities in Dobroudja, that under the hard regime of the Roumanian oligarchy, they will have neither civil and political liberties and rights, nor the needed conditions for a peaceable intellectual and economic development. The return of the Roumanian rule will be a great misfortune for Dobroudja.

6. The vital interests of the Dobroudja population demand a freedom-loving, solid and just government, under the protection of which all the nationalities in Dobroudja will be enabled quietly to advance in the path of culture and general progress. From all the neighbouring states only democratic Bulgaria could give the government craved by the people of Dobroudja.

7. The Dobroudja population, without any distinction as to faith or nationality, many times expressed most emphatically its desire to remain for ever under Bulgarian domination. Both in the elections for the First and those of the Second Dobroudja National Assembly, which were effected through a general voting, it gave to its representatives explicit instructions and unlimited authority to declare to the whole world its will and to resort to all necessary measures in order that it may be realised within the shorest possible time.

8. Conformably to the principle in regard to the free self-determination of nationalities, the Dobroudja inhabitants have the indisputable rights to determine of themselves what its political destiny should be and to fix the political appurtenance of their native land. Any treaty or agreement, contracted or imposed in opposition to this

principle, has no juridical force or obligatoriness for them.

On the ground of the aforesaid and in accordance with the will of the Dobroudja population the Dobroudja National Assemblt unanimously

RESOLVED:

1. Protests against the partition of Dobroudja and against the politico-economical speculations with respect to the future political destiny of the Dobroudja population.
2. Rejects the provisions of art. 10 in the Bucharest treaty, whereby the condominium of Northern Dobroudja is created and declares that they have no juridical force and obligatoriness for the Dobroudja population.
3. Rejects all projects for the creation of a separate autonomous state out of Dobroudja.
4. Declares that the Dobroudja population with arms in hand wilē oppose every attempt to thrust upon it anew the Roumanian rule.
5. Reiterates the resolution of the First Dobroudja National Assembly of December 17 — 1917 and insists that the whole of Dobroudja be immediately annexed to Bulgaria.

Proclaims the Second Dobroudja National Council as the First Dobroudja Provincial National Assembly and elects an Executive Committee of 33 members, which it empowers with unlimited authority to take all necessary measures, together with the Central Dobroudja National Council in order to bring into realisation the will of the Dobroudja people within the nearest favourable political moment.

7. Empowers the Central Dobroudja National Council to announce the present resolution to the governments of the neutral and of the belligerent states.

City of Babadag, September 23 — 1918.

Bureau of the Second Dobroudja National Assembly

(First Dobroudja Provincial National Assembly).

President: **Panayot Stantcheff.**

Vice-Presidents: **Stantcho Marinoff, Ivan Markoff, Andrei Shilke, Condrat Baranoff, Hushem Hussein.**

Secretaries: **Vassil Chobanoff, Peter Sivkoff, Raphael H. Denkoff, Lefter Boyadjieff.**



The second edition of the „**The Political Destiny of Dobroudja**“ in English is in the press and will soon be ready for distribution.

We recommend to our English readers „**Le Mouvement Dobroudjain**“ the periodical publication of the Dobroudja organisation in Bulgaria.

The gentlemen from England who desire to receive gratis the two books: „**The Memoir**“ and „**The Political Destiny of Dobroudja**“ in English as well as the publication „**Le Mouvement Dobroudjain**“ should please apply to:

The Dobroudja Organisation in Bulgaria

Ploshtad Tcherna Djamia, № 5. Sofia. Tel. № 368.

Price 2·20 francs.